



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/972,187

10/04/2001

Yutaka Ishizuka

81868.0035

3122

26021

7590

02/18/2003

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.  
500 S. GRAND AVENUE  
SUITE 1900  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2611

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, MARK A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2872

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/972,187

Applicant(s)

ISHIZUKA, YUTAKA

Examiner

Mark A. Robinson

Art Unit

2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,7,9-11,13,14,16,17 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,5,8,12,15 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2872

DETAILED ACTION

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,4,7,10,11,14,17,19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konno et al.

Konno shows in fig. 1 a polygon mirror(23) formed from copper as a primary component (see col.3 line 25). Konno does not disclose the specific amount of copper in the composition. However, selection of an appropriate composition having the claimed amount of copper would have been obvious at the time of invention, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involved only routine skill in the art. See *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claims 10 and 21, Konno's mirror, being made of copper, would satisfy the claimed reflection characteristics.

Art Unit: 2872

Regarding claims 11 and 19, Konno further discloses a base(28,29) made of ceramic.

3. Claims 3,6,13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konno et al in view of Chan et al.

Konno does not disclose the use of nickel in the mirror. However, Chan discloses the use of nickel in conjunction with copper for a polygon mirror. It would have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of invention to include nickel in Konno's mirror in order to increase the reflectivity of the mirror as taught by Chan. As to the specific amounts of nickel in the composition, selection of an appropriate composition having the claimed amount of nickel would have been obvious at the time of invention, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involved only routine skill in the art. See *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

4. Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Konno et al in view of Nishimura et al.

Konno does not teach a protective film for the mirror. However, such films are well known in the art and an example is shown by Nishimura (note col. 6 lines 33-43). It would have

been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of invention to include such a protective film for Konno's mirror in order to avoid mirror degradation due to deleterious environmental effects.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 2,5,8,12,15 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach or suggest a polygon mirror having the specific composition set forth in these claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Taniguchi, Ishizuka et al, and Iwaki et al disclose various embodiments for polygon mirrors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3506.


Art Unit: 2872

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cassandra Spyrou can be reached at (703) 308-1687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

MR

2/11/03

  
MARK A. ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER